

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 12-29 were pending prior to this Reply. Claim 1 has been amended herein to correct points relating to the indicated variables that were raised by the Examiner as discussed below.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the thorough and thoughtful review of the application and the prior art, and in the allowance of claim 20 and the rejection of claims 1, 12-19 and 21-29 under 35 USC §112. Claims 1 and 12-29 remain pending, with claim 20 being deemed allowed.

1. Claims 1, 12-19, and 21-29 are compliant with 35 USC §112, 2nd ¶.

In section 2, subpart a) of the Office Action, claims 1, 12-19, and 21-29 were rejected under 35 USC §112, 2nd ¶. Applicants appreciate the clarification of the rejection. The structural compound of formula (I) has been amended to show the referenced variable as R¹ rather than R₁. We note that similar errors are found in the depicted structures of formulas (I), (II) and (XI) in the specification and, as such, the effected portions of the specification have also been amended herein. As this rejection has been appropriately addressed by this amendment, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1, 12-19, and 21-29 be withdrawn.

In section 2, subpart b) of the Office Action, claims 1, 9-24, and 29-38 were rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd ¶. It is believed that the Examiner mistakenly refers to claims 9-24 and 30-38 in this rejection, as claims 9-11 were cancelled in a prior amendment, claim 20 has been indicated to be allowed, and claims 30-38 have not been presented. Applicants assume that what was intended is that claims 1, 12-19, and 21-29 were being rejected for “R₁” in the formula of claim 1 not correlating with “R¹” in the text of claim 1. As amended claim 1 resolves this non-correlation issue, it is requested that the rejection of claims 1, 12-19, and 21-29 be withdrawn.

2. The rejections based on variables “R²” and “n” have also been addressed.

In numbered section 3, claims 24 and 34 were indicated as rejected under 35 USC §112, 2nd ¶. Applicants assume that this should have read “Claims 1, 12-19, and 21-29” are

rejected (as reflected in the subsequent subparts a) and b)). In any event, variables "R²" and "n" have been deleted from formula (I). In light of this amendment, it is believed that claims 1, 12-19, and 21-29 comply with 35 USC §112, 2nd ¶.

Claims 22, 25, and 28 have been amended to correct a minor typographical error.

CONCLUSION

In light of the comments and amendments made herein, reconsideration is hereby requested. It is respectfully asserted that the specification is in order, and that claims 1, 12-29 are in condition for allowance. Prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is therefore requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge any fees or to credit any overpayment, particularly including any fees required under 37 CFR §1.16 or §1.17, and any necessary extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 07-1392.

Respectfully submitted,

/James P. Riek/
James P. Riek
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,009

Date: 20-March -2009
Customer No. 23347
GlaxoSmithKline
Corporate Intellectual Property
Five Moore Drive, P.O. Box 13398
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-3398
Telephone: (919) 483-8022
Facsimile: (919) 483-7988